

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/080,861	05/18/1998	HIROSHI ENDO	1272.6808CI/	9856	
5514	7590 04/28/2004		EXAMINER		
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			LEE, TON	LEE, TOMMY D	
NEW YORK,			ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
•			2624	(A)	
			DATE MAILED: 04/28/2004	\mathcal{O}	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

\	Application No.	Appliant/a)	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/080,861	ENDO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas D. Lee	2624	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sneet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 08 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper repl n places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	unt of the fee. The app originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) ⊠ they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	s.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>13-27</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			

8. \square The drawing correction filed on ____ is a) \square approved or b) \square disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

Thomas D. Lee
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2624

10. Other: ____

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendments to base claims 13 and 21, reciting a magnification rate indicated by second magnifying rate information as greater than or equal to 100%, raises new issues. Recitation of image data magnified based on first magnifying rate information raises new issues, as this limitation was not recited in the claims under final rejection, and was denied entry in the prior Advisory Action (Paper No. 25).